

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 12, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-27 are rejected to by the Examiner. Claims 1-27 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0085132 to Choi et al. (hereinafter “Choi ‘132”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,136 to Silverbrook et al. (hereinafter “Silverbrook ‘136”). Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi ‘132 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,927,825 to Silverbrook et al. (hereinafter “Silverbrook ‘825”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,088 to Choi et al. (hereinafter “Choi ‘088”). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi ‘132 in view of Silverbrook ‘825 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,759 to Kondoh (hereinafter “Kondoh”). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi ‘132 in view of Silverbrook ‘825 and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0246388 to Lee et al. (hereinafter “Lee ‘388”). Claims 13, 16-18, 20, 22, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi ‘132 in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/00169629 to Lee et al. (hereinafter “Lee ‘629”) and further in view of Silverbrook ‘825. Claims 14, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi ‘132 in view of Lee ‘629 and further in view of Silverbrook ‘825 and Choi ‘088. Claims 19 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi ‘132 in view of Lee ‘629 and further in view of Silverbrook ‘825 and Lee ‘388. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi ‘132 in view of Lee ‘629 and further in view of Silverbrook ‘825 and Kondoh.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, and 12 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, and 12 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “aligning the initially aligned FLC material, the aligning comprising: applying a first voltage to the common voltage terminal on the source PCB; applying a second voltage to the ground voltage terminal on the source PCB simultaneously with the first voltage to the common voltage terminal on the source

PCB; applying the first voltage to the common voltage terminal formed on the gate PCB; and applying the second voltage to the ground terminal formed on the gate PCB simultaneously with the first voltage to the common voltage terminal formed on the gate PCB.” None of the cited references including Choi ‘132 and Silverbrook, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action the Examiner admits that Choi ‘132 fails to teach the above identified features and cites Silverbrook as teaching the missing feature. What Silverbrook discloses is a standard type of LCD display using an FLC material to display an image. Silverbrook states: “Importantly, the birefringent state of neighbouring or adjacent pixels will be substantially unaffected.” So portion of Silverbrook cited by the Examiner is teaching implementing an image where each of the pixels is independently driven. This is different from the present invention. The present invention is directed to realigning initially aligned FLC material. In producing an LCD device using FLC material, the FLC is initially aligned. During further manufacturing steps this initial alignment may be lost, therefore it is necessary to realign the FLC material. The present invention is directed to this realignment. It is desired to realign the FLC throughout the whole LCD display. This is accomplished by applying a first voltage to the common electrode and a second voltage to the ground terminal. This causes a voltage to be applied simultaneously to each pixel in the display. This is not the case with Silverbrook, contrary to the interpretations by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, and 12 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11 are allowable over Choi ‘132 and Silverbrook for the same reasons as stated above. Further, Choi ‘088, Kondoh, and Lee ‘629 fail to cure the deficiencies of Choi ‘132 and Silverbrook, so claims 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11 are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 13, 16-18, 20, 22-23, and 26 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 13 and 16-18 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “applying the first voltage to the plurality of data lines; and aligning the initially aligned FLC material by applying a second voltage to a common electrode of the LCD panel, wherein the second voltage is different from the first voltage.” Claims 20, 22-23, and 26 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a gamma circuit for generating a substantially uniform voltage independent of a gray scale

value of a digital video data using the first voltage, wherein the first voltage is transmittable to the plurality of data lines via the data driving circuit upon an alignment of the initially aligned FLC material; and a common electrode driving circuit for applying the second voltage to the common electrode upon the alignment of the initially aligned FLC material.”. None of the cited references including Choi ‘132, Lee ‘629, and Silverbrook, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. As Lee ‘629 fails to cure the deficiencies of Choi ‘132 and Silverbrook as discussed above, Claims 13, 16-18, 20, 22-23, and 26 are allowable over Choi ‘132, Lee ‘629, and Silverbrook.

Claims 14, 15, 19, 21, 24, 25, and 27 are allowable over Choi ‘132, Lee ‘629, and Silverbrook for the same reasons as stated above. Further, Choi ‘088, Kondoh, and Lee ‘629 fail to cure the deficiencies of Choi ‘132, Lee ‘388, and Silverbrook, so claims 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Eric J. Nuss  
Registration No. 40,106

Dated: April 12, 2006

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant